

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 4, 6 and 8 have been amended solely to provide proper antecedence and to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claim 3 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 3 has been amended to correct same.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishihara (U.S. Patent No. 5,134,405), and claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishihara. Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on reference.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate features previously set out in claim 4. Amended claim 1 calls for:

means for displaying a radiation diagram associated with the tool based on the video display signal, said means for displaying the radiation diagram including a display screen disposed inside the anechoic chamber to enable the person handling the tool to observe how the handling of the tool affects its electromagnetic behavior. (Emphasis added.)

As acknowledged by the Examiner, "Ishihara et al. does not disclose the display screen is placed on an inside wall of said anechoic chamber." To the contrary, Ishihara describes a monitor that is disposed in a measuring room adjacent to the anechoic chamber and that is separated from the anechoic chamber by an electromagnetically shielded window. (See col.4 11.31-37). The window separating the anechoic chamber and the

measuring room in which the display screen is located is intended to provide electromagnetic shielding protection for the anechoic chamber. In fact, Ishihara teaches using an electromagnetic shield structure all around the anechoic chamber and, in particular, teaches using an electromagnetic shielding net on the window separating the anechoic chamber and the display apparatus of the measuring room to protect against electromagnetic disturbances induced by the surrounding environment, such as are induced by the display screen in the measuring room. (See Fig. 1, col.3 11.12-13 and 20-21, and col.4 11.35-41). Hence, a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art, when considering the teachings of Ishihara, would have been dissuaded from introducing any means for displaying data inside the anechoic chamber as such means would introduce electromagnetic disturbances within the anechoic chamber.

Moreover, unlike a display screen placed inside the anechoic chamber, the shielded window provides poor viewing quality of the display screen to the person inside the anechoic chamber who is handling the tool. Specifically, the size of the window must be reduced to provide sufficient faradization, and such reduced size of the window limits the range of movement available to the person handling the tool inside the anechoic chamber while still being able to observe radiation diagrams and the like on the monitor located inside the measuring room. Further, good faradization of the window requires a compromise between the window's transparency to light and the window's ability to shield against electromagnetic waves. As a result, the use of a display screen seen through a shielded window cannot offer the same viewing quality as that provided by a display screen placed directly in the anechoic chamber.

It follows that Ishihara does not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 1 and therefore does not

anticipate the claim. It further follows that claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over Ishihara.

Claims 4-9 depend from claim 1. Therefore, each of claims 4-9 is distinguishable over Ishihara for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishihara in view of McKivergan (U.S. Patent No. 6,329,953). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on art.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and therefore, each is distinguishable over Ishihara for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on section of McKivergan does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Ishihara.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

820632\_1.DOC